

One Clue to the Proton Size Puzzle: The Emergence of the Electron Membrane Paradigm

Policarpo Yōshin Ulianov
policarpoyu@gmail.com

Abstract

Recent experiments for proton radius measurement [1] [2], based on muonic hydrogen confirmed that the proton size obtained by muon interaction is 4% smaller than the standard value. This results generate a new problem that was called “the proton size puzzle”. The author believes that this occurs because the proton radius changes, depending on the particle with which it is interacting.

In this context the author proposes that the standard proton radius be defined in conditions, where a proton is isolated in space, without interacting with any other particle. In this condition the standard proton radius seems very close to the value obtained in muonic hydrogen experiments.

If this new standard proton radius value be admitted, one solution to the "proton size puzzle" must answer two basic questions:

- a) Why the proton increase it size when interacting with an electron in a hydrogen atom?
- b) Why the proton maintain the (new) standard radius value, when interacting with the muon to form a muonic hydrogen atom?

The question (a) can be answered, in a context where the electric force that arises between the opposite charges (of the electron and the proton) may be affecting the proton and expanding its radius.

Considering the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, with the proton as "observer" of the electron position, the proton also not will "know" where the electron position is. Thus the proton is simultaneously attracted to all positions where the electron might be positioned, which are defined by the orbital wave function.

Thus the uncertainty principle could explain that the proton is subjected to a radial force field, which tends to increase its size.

Another solution for the proton size puzzle, proposed by the author, considers a change in the physical interpretation of the orbital wave functions. These functions are currently associated probability density of the presence of the electron in a given volume of space. In this new interpretation, the wave functions equations are the same, but its final values (that can be expressed in C/m^3) can be associated with an effectively density of electric charge, that exists simultaneously, composing a negative charges membrane which are distributed in space around the atomic nucleus, as defined by the orbital wave function charge densities.

This new model has been called by the author as “Electron Membrane Paradigm” (EMP), because in it the “electron particle” is turning into an “electron membrane”.

The EMP has the potential to solve the proton size puzzle, and allowing the emergence of new theories, that can model both, electrons and other particles, in the form of strings and membranes.

1 – Introduction

In 2010, Dr. Randolph Pohl [1], from the Max Planck Institute of Quantum Optics in Germany, presented the results of experiments based on muonic hydrogen, where the electron is replaced by a muon a particle with a negative charge equal to the electron, but with a mass 206 times greater. These experiments obtained the proton radius of 0.8418(67) fm, a value that is 4% lower than the standard proton radius (0.8775(51)fm). In early 2013 the team of Dr. Aldo Antognini [2], from the Paul Scherrer Institut in Switzerland, presented results of more accurate muonic hydrogen experiments, that generate the proton radius value of 0.84087(39)fm. This new value confirms the Dr. Pohl team results and virtually eliminates the possibility of experimental errors.

Currently physicists around the world are looking for a solution to this problem, which now is commonly referred to as the “proton radius puzzle”.

Many scientists investigate theoretical measure errors, that may explain the proton radius variation, but a plausible explanation for the new proton size is that muons do not interact with the protons in the same way that electrons. This means that the proton radius will change, depending on the particle with which it is interacting.

For the author the first clue to solve the proton size puzzle is to consider that the proton radius value, obtained by muonic hydrogen (0.84087fm) should be used as the new proton standard radius. The author believes that a proton isolated in space, without interacting with any other particle, will present this new standard radius value.

On this way the proton radius does not change when it forming muonic hydrogen, suffering an increase of 4% when the proton interacts with the electron in a hydrogen atom.

One possible explanation for this proton radius increase is due to the electron-proton charges iteration, thereby generating forces which tend to stretch the proton. For this to happen the proton should be subjected to a radial forces field that appear in the case of the electron charges are distributed in the space surrounding the proton.

Thus the author believes that the electron model in hydrogen atom must be reviewed, considering two main lines:

- a) The Heisenberg uncertainty principle must be applied to a proton, acting as an electron “observer”. On this way the proton is unable to determine the electron position. This means that the proton is attracted simultaneously to all points where the electron can be;
- b) The electron "wave/particle" model, described by the orbital wave functions should be revised, considering that these equations calculate not only an electron position density probability. Thus the values defined by the orbital wave functions could be associated with real electric charge densities, with electrons being modeled by some type of membrane.

Option (a) is more conservative and can effectively explain why the proton radius increases when it form a hydrogen atom, but does not explain why the size of the proton does not change when it interacts with a muon.

Option (b) leads to a new model of electron shaped membrane, called by the author of “Electron Membrane Paradigm” (EMP).

The EMP maintain all the equations of an orbital wave function, including keeping the final unit (C/m^3) used in some equations, modifying only the physical interpretation of this function.

In EMP the electron ceases to appear a point particle that revolves around the proton and starts to compose a negative charges continuous membrane, where the total charge is equal to the electron charge. Thus when the electron receives energy and make a orbital change, in fact the electron membrane assumes the new orbital shape.

In this new model when the electron is ejected from the atom, he continues to maintain a spherical shape membrane, which can explains for example the fact that a single electron can interact with itself in a double-slit experiment.

In a EMP expansion, a muon also assumes a membrane shape, but much smaller than the electron membrane.

Thus the in muonic hydrogen, the muon does not "capture" the proton inside it membrane, but only orbits the proton, and so not generating any radial force on the proton, which keeps its (new) standard radius.

1 – Electron Particle/Wave Paradigm

Figure 1 illustrates rapidly the historical advances of the atomic model. The Figure 1(a) shows the model proposed by Thomson in 1897, where the atom form a "plum pudding". The Figure 1(b) shows the atomic model proposed by Rutherford in 1911, known as planetary model, where electrons are represented as small dots orbiting the atomic nucleus.

The experimental impossibility of simultaneously determine the position and velocity of the electron, led Heisenberg to formulate the principle of uncertainty, creating one of the foundations of quantum mechanics. Due to this principle the electron position in one orbital is described in terms of probability density function of finding an electron in some space position.




Figure 1 - Historical evolution of the atomic model.

Thus the electron currently model considers a Particle/Wave Paradigm (PWP) in which the uncertainty principle is applied and the equations defined by Schrödinger are used in the definition of atomic orbital wave functions, as presented in Figure 1(c).

It is important to note that the model of Rutherford electron remains in the basis of PWP, because the orbital wave functions define a density probability distribution of the electron be in a given space volume. Thus the electron is still interpreted until today as a "small ball" orbiting the atomic nucleus.

Figure 2 shows a graphical representation of PWP, where the s-orbital wave function is presented as a spherical shell, which defines where the probability of finding an electron is increased.




Figure 2 - Representation of the wave function of the s-orbital.

Figure 3 shows an alternative representation, where the wave function is associated with a "cloud" of points, that defining where it is more probable that an electron will be found. Thus in a temporal analysis, the orbital wave function also defines an average density value of electric charge that is expressed in C/m^3 .




Figure 3 - The s-orbital seen as a cloud of negative particles.

2 – Heisenberg principle applied to electron-proton interaction

The first contribution of this paper to the proton size puzzle considers the Heisenberg uncertainty principle applied in a context where a proton "observes" an electron when is composing a hydrogen atom.

Figure 4 (a) shows a schematic of the electron orbiting the proton, in which is usually considered that appear attraction forces, between the two particles.




Figure 4 - Forces that arise between an electron and a proton in a hydrogen atom.

Figure 4 (b) represents the application of uncertainty principle to own proton, that not being capable of determine the electron position, and so the proton do not know in what direction the electron is. On this way the proton will be subjected to a radial forces field, compound by forces that link this proton to all positions where the electron could

be located. Thus when forming a hydrogen atom, the proton increases its size, what responds partially to the proton size puzzle. But this model does not explain why the proton does not increase its size when interacting with a muon.

3 – Electron Membrane Paradigm

The Electron Membrane Paradigm (EMP), proposed by the author, abandons the Rutherford electron model and sees the electron as it is composed of a membrane, which takes the shape of an atomic orbital wave function.

It is important to note that the EMP has the same formulas defined in the electron particle/wave paradigm, changing only the physical interpretation of the wave functions. So in the EMP an orbital wave function does not represent probability density distribution, and becomes associated with a real electrical charge density distribution, defining thus a membrane composed of negative charges surrounding the atomic nucleus.

The EMP proposes a solution to the proton size puzzle, which is shown in Figure 5.




Figure 5 - Forces that arise between proton: (a) In a normal hydrogen atom; (b) In a muonic hydrogen.

In Figure 5(a) we observe that the electron membrane generates attractive forces that stretch the proton in all directions, tending to increase the proton radius.

The muonic hydrogen case is represented in Figure 5(b), where the muon also forms a membrane, but it is much smaller than the electron membrane. Thus the muon cannot “capture” the proton inside its membrane, and so it orbits around the proton as provided in the standard model. In this condition the muon charge cannot generate forces that increase the proton radius.

If Figure 5 were drawn on a scale where the proton has the size of a marble, the electron membrane could cover a football field, while the muon membrane would be the size of a pizza. Thus, in a hydrogen atom, the electron “captures” the proton within its membrane, while in the muonic hydrogen, the muon only orbits the proton, as shown in Figure 5.

4 – And even if the electron is in fact a membrane?

At particle/wave paradigm the electron is associated with a point particle, but due to Heisenberg's uncertainty principle it can only be studied in a statistical way, being associated with a wave function, which defines regions with the highest probability density of the electron to be found.

However the assumption that the electron is composed by a negative charges membrane sheds new light on the historical evolution of atomic models. If this hypothesis is true, the Rutherford atom planetary model becomes as distant from reality as the "plum pudding" atom model proposed by Thomson.

In addition to an electron membrane shaped, the questions "What is the position of the electron?" and "What is the speed of the electron?" stop of making sense, why in these membrane will exist sets of negatively charged particles, each one assuming a certain position and speed.

In a simple analogy we can, for example ask: "What is the position of the Eiffel tower, in relation to the earth's surface?", hoping to get answered by a pair of coordinates (latitude and longitude).

Moreover in the EMP, ask what is the position of an electron in an atomy orbit is equivalent to asking what is the Europe position, in relation to the earth's surface, waiting to get a pair of numeric values in response. In this analogy we could say that there is some "uncertainty" in the Europe position, setting a probability function that describes where Europe can be found, resulting in a world map where the European continent is highlighted.

The author believes that for the case of electrons orbiting the atomic nucleus the uncertainty principle, proposed by Heisenberg, becomes a "right answer" to a "wrong question."

Trying to get a point on the map we and found a continent, and precisely define its contours and its relief, but for historical reasons we are not able yet to accept the results, and so we continue thinking that this continent is just a dot on the map.

5 – EMP opens points

The EMP allows some variation in electron membrane representations, such as:

- The electron can be considered as gelatinous membrane which occupies exactly the region defined by the wave function, somewhat similar to that shown in Figure 2.
- The electron may be composed of a cloud of points, similar to that shown in Figure 3. These points would be associated with "micro-electrons", particles formed by punctual negative charges;
- The electron is formed by a two dimensional spherical shell (or with a very small thickness, for example equal to Planck length). Thus the electron only partially takes the shape one orbital wave function. On this way the electron spherical shell would tend to rotate and oscillate, slightly varying its position around the proton.

Each of these models can be associated with certain orbital wave functions, and the final value of charge density (C/m^3) defined by the equations may either be due to some electrical charges that exists simultaneously, but also can associated with the movement of this charges in the space.

It is important to mention the EMP also has some critical points, such as: If the electron is in fact made of negative charges set, how their charge remains together, despite the electrical repulsion forces? This type of problem can be solved in several ways, like the definition of a new type of forces that hold the electron membrane together.

Moreover the EMP has the potential to clarify some aspects of the electron behavior. For example, an electron moving in vacuum in the standard model is considered as a point particle, while in the EMP this electron assumes the shape of a spherical shell, with a diameter slightly larger than a hydrogen atom, which could explain better as a single electron can generates the phenomenon of diffraction at a double slit experiment.

6 – Conclusion

The Rutherford planetary atom model was completed a century and until today give some basis for the particle/wave paradigm that defines the electron. Even the Schrödinger equations, which define the orbital wave function, are interpreted as density probability distribution functions of finding the Rutherford "planetary electron" in a certain region of space.

In the hypothesis that the electron is effectively a membrane, a relatively small step would need form the particle/wave paradigm to the adoption of an electron membrane paradigm. In fact the EMP assumes the same equations end units (C/m^3) needing only a new physical interpretation to orbital wave functions, where it defines a real density of electrical charges distribution. But the planetary atom model is very rooted in the physics foundations and so a new electron membrane paradigm could be easy accepted.

In this scenario the author believes that the experiments with muonic hydrogen performed by the Dr. R. Pohl and of Dr. Antognini teams should in future become a landmark in modern physics, with the potential to be as important, such as the historical experience of the Michelson interferometer, which marked the end of the preponderance of Newtonian mechanics.

In fact the experiments with muonic hydrogen give us the first opportunity in the physics history to overcome the Rutherford atom model, laying aside the naive attempt to adapt the patterns that we observe in our solar system, in order to describe the atoms behaviors.

It should be noted that the EMP generates a series of new challenges, such as explaining why the repulsive forces that arise between the negative charges do not break the electron membrane.

Besides the EMP opens a new possibility to undertake, new types of theories that may, for example, model other types of particles, including the proton and neutron through strings and membranes.

The own author proposed a new string theory [1], which relies on the existence of a complex time, where the collapse of the imaginary time turns off particles in strings and membranes.

On the context of this theory, the author has developed a model [4] in which the proton is also observed as a membrane, with positive charges shells forming a solid structure, like the layers of an onion.

This model allows calculating the radius of a proton isolated in space, by the following equation:

$$r_p = \frac{4 \hbar}{c m_p} \quad (1)$$

Where \hbar is the reduced Planck constant, c is the light speed and m_p the proton mass, being obtained:

$$r_p = 0.84123 \text{ fm}$$

This value is only 0.043% higher than the proton radius obtained in the experiment with muonic hydrogen [2]. An error so small seems to demonstrate that the new models presented by the author in [3] and [4] have some validity. However acceptance of equation (1) demand that the physical community breaking a large number of paradigms, including the existence of complex time, the possibility of modeling protons, electrons and muons as membranes, and the possibility that the mass of a particle is related to the “number of turns” on the string that defines its membrane. These innovative concepts can be currently only fanciful ideas, but there is also the possibility of them being true, and so the equation (1) can be used in the future as the basis to defining the standard proton size.

7 – References

[1] Randolf Pohl, Aldo Antognini, François Nez, Fernando D. Amaro, François Biraben, João M. R. Cardoso, Daniel S. Covita, Andreas Dax, Satish Dhawan, Luis M. P. Fernandes, Adolf Giesen, Thomas Graf, Theodor W. Hänsch, Paul Indelicato, Lucile Julien, Cheng-Yang Kao, Paul Knowles, Eric-Olivier Le Bigot, Yi-Wei Liu, José A. M. Lopes, Livia Ludhova, Cristina M. B. Monteiro, Françoise Mulhauser, Tobias Nebel, Paul Rabinowitz, Joaquim M. F. dos Santos, Lukas A. Schaller, Karsten Schuhmann, Catherine Schwob, David Taqqu, João F. C. A. Veloso & Franz Kottmann: **The size of the proton**. In: Nature; 466, 213-216; 8 July 2010.

[2] Aldo Antognini, François Nez, Karsten Schuhmann, Fernando D. Amaro, François Biraben, João M. R. Cardoso, Daniel S. Covita, Andreas Dax, Satish Dhawan, Marc Diepold, Luis M. P. Fernandes, Adolf Giesen, Andrea L. Gouvea, Thomas Graf, Theodor W. Hänsch, Paul Indelicato, Lucile Julien, Cheng-Yang Kao, Paul Knowles, Franz Kottmann, Eric-Olivier Le Bigot, Yi-Wei Liu, José A. M. Lopes, Livia Ludhova, Cristina M. B. Monteiro, Françoise Mulhauser, Tobias Nebel, Paul Rabinowitz, Joaquim M. F. dos Santos, Lukas A. Schaller, Catherine Schwob, David Taqqu, João F. C. A. Veloso, Jan Vogelsang, Randolf Pohl: **Proton structure from the measurement of 2S – 2P transition frequencies of muonic hydrogen**. In : Science, 25 January 2013

[3] Policarpo Y. Ulianov: **Ulianov String Theory - A new representation for fundamental particles**. January 2012. In: <http://vixra.org/abs/1201.0101>

[4] Policarpo Y. Ulianov: **Explaining the Variation of the Proton Radius in Experiments with Muonic Hydrogen**. January 2012. In: <http://vixra.org/abs/1201.0099>